

**WASTE 2 RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**\*\* MEETING SUMMARY \*\***  
**July 17, 2012, 9:30 a.m.**

---

Dean Large, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and introductions were made. Dean also introduced Jane Dewell and Jeanne Fulcher from the Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance. They will facilitate today's funding priorities discussion.

Dean asked for a motion to approve the May 15 meeting notes. There was a motion to adopt them. The motion was seconded and the notes were approved.

***Discussion on Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account (WRRLCA)***

Agenda Item Purpose and Ground Rules – Jane Dewell, Jeanne Fulcher

Jane reiterated the purpose of this agenda item, which we'll discuss today and at another meeting or two as we move forward. The purpose is to discuss priorities for the 30 percent portion of the Waste Reduction, Recycling and Litter Control Account (WRRLCA).

The group brainstormed ground rules, including:

- Turn off cell phones.
- Express ideas openly and honestly.
- Work together.
- No side conversations.
- Everyone should be heard and engage.
- Raise hands.
- Respect differences

Background Information – Laurie Davies

Laurie reviewed handouts provided to the group on the history of WRRLCA from 2009-13, including budget provisos and reductions.

Laurie also discussed the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Account. There seems to be a lack of understanding on what activities Ecology can spend funding for. The MTCA Account is larger than WRRLCA and includes pass-through dollars to local governments. This year there's a one-time add in MTCA to fund activities previously funded by WRRLCA.

Laurie reviewed W2R's primary funding sources and what activities they fund.

Vicki Christophersen requested a document showing what's required by statute, how Ecology implements those requirements, and the dollar amounts.

Art Starry agreed it would be valuable if we can see what the law mandates. Laurie pointed out that what the law mandates for WRRLCA is pretty broad compared to MTCA.

Suellen Mele wanted to know how much the total amounts are for MTCA. *Update: Following are specifics to help answer Suellen's question.*

MTCA for W2R	LTCA	STCA
Capital	\$122 M (All CPG, RAG, PPG Grants)	\$1.7 M
Operating	\$3.5 M	\$8 M
Total	\$125.5 M	\$9.7 M

Laurie agreed to provide more information reflecting MTCA funding at Ecology and in W2R.

It was asked if the budget provisos will end at the end of this biennium. Laurie said we thought so, but that is also part of the purpose of the committee's discussions now underway.

Dean asked if our focus is on WRRLCA activities. Laurie said yes, although there have been questions asked about use of the other funding sources.

#### Clarifying Questions on Background – Jane Dewell

Jane asked the committee if they had additional questions. They had none.

#### Share Values for Waste Reduction and Recycling – Jane Dewell, Jeanne Fulcher

Jane asked the committee to share their values for Waste Reduction and Recycling. The group shared the following values:

- Mindful consumption so there are enough natural resources for all.
- Sustainability.
- Match recycling levels to markets.
- Ditto to the last comment – It does no good to recycle materials that remain in storage.
- Practical and effective programs.
- Reduce waste.
- Be realistic – Programs need to be achievable.
- Work cooperatively.
- Expand on sustainability: financial, political and environmental.
- Practical balance.
- Protect public health.
- Sustainable, but also waste prevention beginning with manufacturers.
- Protect natural resources.
- Benefit people who pay the taxes – Look at the intent of the funding.
- Instill environmental priorities.
- Properly informed committee and public.

- Balance interests of stakeholders.
- Prioritize programs to those that have the most effective and measurable impact on waste reduction and recycling.
- Focus on the taxed products for effective programs.
- Sustainable funding for local governments ongoing core projects.
- Locally defined and state supported programs.
- Move forward statutorily mandated waste management hierarchy.
- Add funding to the sustainability statement made earlier (above).
- Environmental protection (greenhouse gases, toxics and water).
- Materials management evolving.
- Product stewardship.
- Lifecycle (in broad terms).

Define Success for Advisory Committee – Jane Dewell, Jeanne Fulcher

Jane got a lot of feedback from the group on questions she sent them in advance of this meeting. There were themes around the definition of success. The key terms Jane got from sampling about 16 committee members include:

- Understand.
- Open and honest.
- Set goals.
- Representation.
- Priorities.
- Establish funding priorities.
- Agree.
- Consensus.

Jane explained that consensus is general agreement, not unanimous agreement. The majority of members who responded to her questions talked about consensus. Jerry Smedes pointed out the committee is an advisory committee. Laurie said her goal is to reach consensus as a group and not battle on issues after the fact at another level. Dean said when there is no consensus, Ecology should understand/acknowledge what those perspectives are. However, those differences have not always been effectively communicated to Ecology (full disclosure). We need to have people declare whether they agree or not. Laurie pointed out that silence doesn't mean consensus.

Vicki Christophersen said it's very difficult to talk about the 30 percent portion of WRRLCA alone. The funds are intertwined. She doesn't think overall the funds have been prioritized to be truly transparent and accountable to the Legislature. There is no clear understanding of what Waste Reduction and Recycling work is. For example, Representative Upthegrove has questions about what waste reduction and recycling means day to day. Laurie pointed out some of the priorities that drive the W2R Program are at the agency level.

Jane clarified with Vicki that Vicki thinks the 30 percent focus is too narrow. Vicki said the focus should include MTCA, and local and state toxics, too. There needs to be a better understanding of the priorities and any restrictions.

Art Starry said looking at the whole MTCA Account would be a huge undertaking. We would need additional people in the room. Jerry Smedes said we could strip away what we do agree on. Are we in agreement on the activities with funding overlap? Janine Bogar suggested that we start where we know we need to talk (e.g. the WRRLCA 30 percent). If we find areas, e.g. PPG that we still need to talk about, then we can talk about them later with other stakeholder groups as appropriate. But by default, discussing what activities to use the 30 percent for will bring up what activities we use MTCA for in the overlapping areas.

Dean said it would be helpful in our discussion on the 30 percent portion of WRRLCA to understand the areas funded by LTCA and STCA, and consider if we're spending too much on activities in the "overlap" areas that should go elsewhere.

#### Define Next Steps – Jane Dewell

Jane asked the committee what kind of meeting they want to have next.

Kevin Kiernan asked what kind of timeline/target we have to complete these discussions. Laurie said by the committee's November meeting, and hopefully as we go into next legislative session.

Several committee members reiterated the request for more funding information. They asked questions about what amount of funding each circle on the funding handout represented, how much is in the overlap area, and how dollar amounts have been prioritized.

Suellen Mele suggested sending funding information out in advance of the next meeting. Laurie said she'll send it out by August 10.

Jerry Smedes asked about CPG and PPG applications vs. grants. Are there unmet needs? Laurie said CPG is a formula-based program divided among health departments and then local governments. Whatever is left unrequested goes through a competitive process where applications are reviewed and scored. PPG has percentages set by statute, though it has been cut in recent years.

Sandra Cannon commented that for the next meeting, the committee needs to understand the funding prioritization process.

Stephanie Kassoy asked if there are effectiveness measures of different activities. Do we have information on how suspending the litter information campaign has impacted litter? Laurie responded that examples of program measures include a Beyond Waste Progress Report, OFM Performance Measures, waste characterization studies, and road cleanliness information.

Should the committee consider having an additional meeting? Jane suggested convening a subgroup. Gene Eckhardt suggested conference calls to flesh out questions.

Laurie Davies said we'll hold a conference call or webinar after Labor Day, but before the September committee meeting. Laurie will send out additional information (from the "Parking Lot" below) for the conference call by August 10. Committee members are to send any questions to Ecology regarding the information Laurie sends them by August 27.

"Parking Lot" Items:

- Jan Gee wants to see a document showing what's required by statute, how Ecology implements those requirements, and the dollar amounts.
- Jessica Moore will provide a handout showing where MTCA funding is going now.

***Agenda Items for Future Meetings***

- Scrap Metal Buyers & Need for NPDES Permits, TBD
- Presentation on Public Participation Grants - Jason Alberich, TBD
- EPA's New Sustainable Materials Management Program – Issues We Can Work on Together – Lisa McArthur, TBD

***Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.***

**Submitted by:** Susanne McLemore